

REMARKS

On November 6, 2007, Examiner Chai (571-272-3788) initiated phone calls with Aaron C. Deditch (reg. no. 33,865) to offer certain proposed amendments to the claims, and on November 28, 2007 the final proposed amendments as detailed in the Examiner's Amendment and Interview Summary were entered. In particular, claims 13 and 23 were amended as follows:

13. (Proposed Amended) A method for transcribing at least one data record of an external data source to a processor unit, comprising:
transmitting the at least one data record from the external data source together with additional information to a buffer memory of the processor unit, the additional information including an identifier assigned individually to the processor unit;
performing, in the processor unit, a check of an admissibility of a use of the at least one data record based on the additional information;
generating a blocking signal when the check indicates that the use of the at least one data record is not allowed;
deleting the at least one data record from the buffer memory; and
generating an enable signal when the use of the at least one data record is allowed;
~~comparing a code word from a code word memory having a stored list of code words, the code word memory being of the processor unit; and~~
comparing the identifier, transmitted together with the at least one data record, with a code word from a code word memory having a stored list of code words, the code word memory being of the processor unit to determine whether the use of the at least one data record at the processor unit is allowed, wherein with each check of the identifier in the processor unit another code word is used and therefore each code word identifier is valid only once and no longer available for use.

23. (Proposed Amended) A processor unit, comprising:
a buffer memory;
a rewritable functional memory that is accessible during an operation of the processor unit, the buffer memory and the rewritable function memory being capable of storing at least one data record;
an interface for importing the at least one data record and additional information into the buffer memory; and
a check unit for checking a validity of the at least one data record;
a transmitting arrangement to transmit the at least one data record from the external data source together with additional information to a buffer memory of the processor unit, the additional information including an identifier assigned individually to the processor unit;
a checking arrangement to check an admissibility of a use of the at least one data record based on the additional information;
a generating arrangement to generate a blocking signal when the check indicates that the use of the at least one data record is not allowed; deleting the at least one data record from the buffer memory; and to generate an enable signal when the use of the at least one data record is allowed; and

a comparing arrangement to compare the identifier, transmitted together with the at least one data record, with a code word from a code word memory having a stored list of code words, the code word memory being of the processor unit to determine whether the use of the at least one data record at the processor unit is allowed, wherein with each check of the identifier in the processor unit another code word is used and therefore each code word identifier is valid only once and no longer available for use

~~wherein in a code word memory of the processor unit a list of code words is stored, the identifier being compared with the code word, and wherein with each check of the identifier in the processor unit another code word is used and thus also spent.~~

It is noted that the Interview Summary form that was used by the Examiner was PTOL-413, which states that Applicant is given one month from the Interview date (November 6, 2007) or one month from its mailing date (November 28, 2007), whichever is later.

However, since this was an Examiner initiated interview, it is respectfully submitted that PTOL-413B should have been used, and since the case was allowed, the first box of Part III of that form should have provided that Applicant did not need to provide a separate record of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the Application, and since the Examiner provided a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability (which was done here).

As explained above, the Examiner Amendment and Interview Summary is correct as to the fact that Applicants agreed to amend claims 13 and 23 as above to allow the case.

If Applicant had initiated the Interview (which was not the case), then PTOL-413 would have been the proper form to use.

The foregoing procedures are documented and explained in the M.P.E.P. At 713.04 (pages 700-182 to 700-186).

Since, however, the Examiner sent form PTOL-413, it is believed that this response satisfies the request for Applicant to file a Statement of the Substance of the Interview (see pages 700-184 and 700-185 of the M.P.E.P.).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowed in view of the Notice of Allowability. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present application issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,


Dated: 12/21/2007

By: 

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO 26646


33 865
Aaron C.
O'DONOGHUE